

Integration of State and Federal Accountability Programs

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST'S OFFICE

Presented To:
Assembly Budget Subcommittee No. 2

May 6, 2003





Major Features of the Public Schools Accountability Act

- ✓ **Academic Performance Index (API)**
 - Ranks schools in deciles 1 through 10 based on results from student assessments.
- ✓ **Governor's Performance Awards**
 - Provides rewards to schools that improve their API scores annually (if funded in the budget).
- ✓ **Intervention Programs**
 - Immediate Intervention for Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) for schools in deciles 1 through 5 not meeting API targets.
 - High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) for lowest-performing schools starting with API decile 1 (added to Public Schools Accountability Act in 2001).
- ✓ **Sanctions**
 - Sanctions schools in II/USP and HPSGP that do not make their API growth targets.
 - Sanctions range from assigning an intervention team to closing the school.

- State system focuses on growth in overall student achievement from year to year.
- Interventions targeted at school level.
- School districts have limited formal role.



Major Features of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Accountability Requirements

One Integrated State and Federal Accountability System

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

- ✓ Requires schools to meet annual objectives so all students reach proficiency by 2013-14.

Rewards

- ✓ Requires states to provide monetary and/or nonmonetary awards for making AYP.

Program Improvement—Intervention and Sanction Programs

- ✓ **Level 1—School Choice**
 - Develop a two-year improvement plan.
 - Use 10 percent of Title I funds for professional development focused on school improvement.
 - Provide students with the option to transfer to any other school in the school district and pay the transportation costs.
- ✓ **Level 2—Supplemental Services**
 - Level 1 interventions.
 - Use Title I funds to obtain tutoring/after school program from State Department of Education (SDE) approved public or private provider.
- ✓ **Level 3—Corrective Action.** Level 1 and 2 interventions, plus school district must do one of the following:
 - Replace responsible staff.
 - Implement new curriculum.
 - Significantly decrease management authority at school level.
 - Appoint an external expert to advise school.
 - Extend school day or school year.
 - Restructure internal organization of school.
- ✓ **Level 4—Restructuring.** Level 1, 2, and 3 interventions, plus prepare a plan that must be implemented within one year. Options include:
 - Reopen school as charter school.
 - Replace most of the school staff.
 - Hire private management company to operate school.
 - Turn the operation over to SDE.
 - Other major restructuring.



Comparison of State and Federal Accountability Programs

Item	State		Federal	
	II/USP	HPSGP	CSRD	Program Improvement
Number of schools	1,287	562 approved 86 pending	196	814
Eligibility	Bottom 5 deciles	Bottom 5 deciles—only decile 1 funded to date	Competitive grant process primarily for Title I schools	Title I Schools
Entry criteria	Fail API for one year	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Fail AYP for two years
Planning funds	\$50,000 grant	Optional \$50,000 grant	No grant	No grant
Plan requirements	22 specific requirements	All II/USP requirements plus four additional requirements	11 specific components. Must use research-based model	Research based plan
Intervention year 1	Implement action plan—\$200 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$400 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$200 per pupil	Intra-district choice
Intervention year 2	Implement action plan—\$200 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$400 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$200 per pupil	Choice and supplemental services
Intervention year 3	Exit, sanctions, or significant growth and \$200 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$400 per pupil	Implement action plan—\$200 per pupil	Choice, supplemental services, corrective action by school district
Intervention year 4	Continue sanctions	Exit, sanctions, or significant growth at \$400 per pupil.	If part of II/USP or HPSGP, exit, sanctions, or significant growth	Plan for restructuring
Intervention year 5	Continue sanctions	Continue sanctions	Continue sanctions	Restructuring
Exit criteria	Meet growth targets two years in a row	Not specified	II/USP or HPSGP exit criteria apply if under those programs	Make AYP two consecutive years
Sanctions funding	\$150 per pupil, \$75,000 to \$125,000 for School Assistance and Intervention Teams	Not specified	II/USP or HPSGP sanctions apply if under those programs	Title I 2 percent School Improvement set-aside provides funding for LEAs to support PI schools.



Universe of Low-Performing Schools In State and Federal Programs

Program	Number of Schools
Federal Program Improvement only	289
II/USP only	690
HPSGP only	239
CSRDa only	18
PI ^b and II/USP	213
PI and CSRDa	17
PI and HPSGP	101
PI, II/USP, and HPSGP	131
PI, II/USP and CSRDa	34
PI, CSRDa, and HPSGP	12
II/USP and CSRDa	61
II/USP and HPSGP	111
HPSGP and CSRDa	7
II/USP, CSRDa, and HPSGP	30
PI, II/USP, CSRDa, and HPSGP	17
Total	1,970

^a Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration.
^b Program Improvement.

- As of April 2003, there are 1,970 low-performing schools in state and federal programs, including 86 potential schools for High Priority Schools Grant Program (HPSGP) cohort 2.
- 734 schools are in more than one intervention program.
- Integrating accountability programs would reduce duplication of effort and contain costs and create a more consistent and coherent accountability system.



Problems With Existing Two Accountability Systems

- The Academic Performance Index (API) and the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) measure different goals. Using them together creates confusion.

- Multiple intervention programs create mixed messages.

- Cost of continuing duplicative programs high.
 - Multiple interventions will be at the same schools.
 - Large number of schools will enter Program Improvement (PI) in the next few years.
 - Number of schools sanctioned by the Immediate Intervention for Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP) estimated to increase from 24 in 2002-03 to 100 in 2003-04 and 230 in 2004-05.

- NCLB creates unrealistic standards.
 - Large number of schools will be identified as low-performing.
 - State definition of proficiency too stringent.



Framework for an Integrated Accountability System

- Focus state interventions at the school district level.
- Target state interventions at the neediest schools.
- Provide less intensive interventions at higher-performing schools.
- Redesign HPSGP to serve both state and federal purposes.
- Transition schools in state intervention programs to new system expeditiously.
- Change definition of proficiency to reflect being on track to pass the California High School Exit Exam.



Funding for Restructured Accountability System

- We recommend setting aside \$50 million in Proposition 98 funds for a restructured accountability system in 2003-04 to fund short-falls anticipated in II/USP and HPSGP.

- State could save approximately \$32 million if it does not fund significant growth for schools in II/USP cohort 2.

- Federal funds supporting intervention and sanction programs.
 - Federal funds from Title I set-aside for PI. An expenditure plan for these funds has not yet been developed.
 - \$31.4 million in 2003-04.
 - \$15 million carryover from 2002-03.
 - \$40 million in federal CSRD funds for school-level interventions.